REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected pending claims 1 through 19. Specifically, the pending claims stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,167,449 to Arnold, et al. ("Arnold"). Applicant thanks the Examiner for his instructions regarding the proper language and form for the Abstract of the Disclosure. Applicant submits herewith a new Abstract that conforms to the requirements of 37 CFR 1.72(b) and MPEP §608.01(b) in all respects.

Claim 1 of the present invention is directed towards a method for providing access to the logic units of a first computer system at a second computer system, wherein one or more of the logic units of the first system are externally invocable, and wherein the second system issues searches for invocable logic units and commands to invoke logic units that may be captured externally. The method of claim 1 comprises capturing a search of invocable logic units issues from the second system, returning a list of one or more externally invocable logic units of the first system as a result of the captured search and capturing a command to invoke a logic unit issued from the second system. If the logic unit identified in the captured command is a listed logic unit, the method further comprises causing the first system to invoke the identified logic unit, receiving the results of the invocation of the identified logic unit from the first system, and returning the results to the second system.

Arnold discusses a solution to the problem of when an application needs to browse for services according to a particular protocol on a network other than the one in which the application resides. Col. 1, ln. 66 – Col. 2, ln. 4. More specifically, Arnold discusses a solution "for identifying and locating network services" by employing "a

software interface between applications that need to locate services on a network and provides of identification services." Col. 2, lns. 15-20. According to one embodiment, the interface is a Network Service Location manager program ("NLS manager") that allows an application to find services without having to specify the exact location or be configured according to the protocol used by the provider of the service. Col. 2, lns. 20-26.

Arnold fails to teach or suggest the elements of claim 1 of the present invention. First, Arnold does not teach or suggest capturing a search for invocable logic units. Arnold, at most, teaches an interface that is configured to access service identification protocol (SIP) servers under predefined network protocols, and identifies LDAP, SLP and DNS as some examples of SIP servers. Col. 3, lns. 35-48. As the Examiner concedes in the Office Action, the specification clearly acknowledges that the interface "looks up the type of service in each SIP server's database." Col. 3, lns. 56-58. As SIP is only concerned with identifying services, however, Arnold fails to teach or suggest capturing searches for invocable logic units.

Arnold also fails to discuss the claimed element of returning a list of one or more externally invocable logic units of the first system as a result for the captured search. Arnold, by contrast, returns only a list of service names and network locations, Col. 4, lns. 10-16, thereby allowing any application to browse for network services without being configured with the network protocol of the service provider. Col. 4, lns. 17-19. Indeed, this is the purpose to which the systems and methods of Arnold are directed, as opposed to the present invention of claim 1, which is a method for providing access to the logic units of a first computer system at a second computer system. Col. 5,

lns. 55-57 ("embodiments of the invention permit easier integration of service browsing and search features into applications").

The Examiner is also mistaken that Arnold shows the element, as amended, of capturing at the first system a command to invoke a logic unit issued from the second system. As the section cited by the Examiner states, "the application can cause a more specialized application (such as a Web browser) to be launched which can then use the URL [provided by the interface and received from the SIP server] to easily access the provider's services. Col. 4, lns. 22-25. This, however, does not teach or suggest the element as amended, which requires capturing at a first system a command to invoke a logic unit issued by the second system. According to Arnold, in the parlance of the present application, the second system is capturing a location or address and invoking execution of a "more specialized application," Col. 4, lns. 22-23, as opposed to the presently claimed element of capturing at the first system a command from the second system.

Similarly, Arnold fails to discuss causing the first system to invoke the identified logic unit. The specialized application that Arnold discusses, which is a web browser, is executed on the second system -- there is no teaching or suggestion of the first system invoking the identified logic unit. As claimed, the result of the invocation is then returned the second system; Arnold is silent in this regard.

As Arnold fails to teach or suggest the elements of independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection an allowance of claim 1. Arnold also fails to teach or suggest each element of independent claims 13 and 19 for

substantially similar reasons and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of independent claims 13 and 19.

Regarding independent claims 9, Arnold fails to teach the element of capturing at the first system a command to invoke a logic unit issued from the second system. As the section cited by the Examiner states, "the application can cause a more specialized application (such as a Web browser) to be launched which can then use the URL [provided by the interface and received from the SIP server] to easily access the provider's services." Col. 4, lns. 22-25. This, however, does not teach or suggest the element as amended, which requires capturing at a first system a command to invoke a logic unit issued by the second system. According to Arnold, in the parlance of the present application, the second system is capturing a location or address and invoking execution of a "more specialized application," Col. 4, lns. 22-23, as opposed to the presently claimed element of capturing at the first system a command from the second system. For at least this reason, Arnold fails to teach or suggest the elements of independent claim 9 and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection an allowance of claim 9.

Turning to independent claim 10, Arnold fails to teach the elements of capturing at the first system a search for invocable logic units issued from the second system and returning a list of one or more externally invocable logic units of the first system as a result for the captured search. First, Arnold does not teach or suggest capturing at a first system a search for invocable logic units. Arnold, at most, teaches an interface that is configured to access service identification protocol (SIP) servers under predefined network protocols, and identifies LDAP, SLP and DNS as some examples of

SIP servers. Col. 3, lns. 35-48. As the Examiner concedes in the Office Action, the specification clearly acknowledges that the interface "looks up the type of service in each SIP server's database." Col. 3, lns. 56-58. As SIP is only concerned with identifying services, Arnold fails to teach or suggest capturing searches for invocable logic units.

Arnold also fails to discuss the claimed element of returning a list of one or more externally invocable logic units of the first system as a result for the captured search. Arnold, by contrast, returns only a list of service names and network locations, Col. 4, lns. 10-16, thereby allowing any application to browse for network services without being configured with the network protocol of the service provider. Col. 4, lns. 17-19. Indeed, this is the purpose to which the systems and methods of Arnold are directed, as opposed to the present invention of claim 1, which is a method for providing access to the logic units of a first computer system at a second computer system. Col. 5, lns. 55-57.

For at least these reasons, Arnold fails to teach or suggest the elements of independent claim 10 and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection an allowance of claim 10.

Independent claim 6 is also distinguishable over Arnold for substantially similar reasons as presented in connection with independent claim 1. Furthermore, applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of the NSL manager of Fig. 2 running on a separate machine as suggested by the dashed box. Contrary to the Examiner's characterization, the dashed box of Fig. 2 "shows the interface 120 having a network service location manager program ("NSL manager") 114 and one ormore network access software components such as plug-ins 118*a*, 118*b*, 118*c*, and 118*d*." Col.

5, lns. 13-16. Thus, the specification indicates that the dashed box of Fig. 2 is the interface, and the specification does not suggest that the interface may run on a separate machine. As there is no teaching or suggestion in Arnold a third system as claimed, Arnold fails to anticipate independent claim 6. For at least these reasons and those presented in connection with independent claim 1, Arnold fails to teach or suggest the elements of independent claim 6 and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection an allowance of claim 6.

The dependent claims of the present application contain additional features that further substantially distinguish the invention of the present application over the prior art of record. Given the applicants' position on the patentability of the independent claims, however, it is not deemed necessary at this point to delineate such distinctions.

To expedite prosecution of this application to allowance, the examiner is invited to call the applicants' undersigned representative to discuss any remaining issues relating to this application

Dated: December 6, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Seth H. Ostrow
Reg. No. 37,410
BROWN RAYSMAN MILLSTEIN
FELDER & STEINER LLP
900 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022
(212) 895-2000

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited this date with the U.S. Postal Service as First Class Mail addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Seth H. Ostrow 12-6-04
Date